March 9, 1968

Dear Harold,

Thanks for the recent letter discussing the role of Oswald in the assassination. It seems to me that you suggest two things in your letter, (1) Oswald's associates were not exactly clean but had some connection with the killing of J. F. K.(?) and (2) Oswald was blackmailed. The crux of your argument is that he was a patsy in Dallas largely due to the work of the police dept.? This is contrasted to my opinion that Oswald was set up directly by his cronies. If he was in the organization, for one reason or another, blackmail of one kind or another, it seems to me that he could be drawn into the periphery of the movement. I doubt whether he ever considered himself in the role of an assassin or an accessory to any crime to be plotted against J. F. K. He could have been told that J. F. K. was hostile to the Cuban movement and that he bore watching... Or that J. F. K. was a threat to any action taken by the Cuban refugees to regain their position in the old regime by starting their own regime and using private as well as federal funds to go back to Cuba. Who knows exactly what he was told?

Thus I do not see much difference between your position and mine except that you want Oswald to be a bit more heroic under duress than I. Also you have the facts and I do not. I guess you are right and I am wrong. But it is worth looking into... I am not interested so much in Oswald as I am in the character of the organization which

killed President Kennedy.

Once the character of that group is fully comprehended the line of complicity can be drawn from the bottom up. One can spin out their associations and investigate each new group which appears. Hopefully the line of command can then be delimited within the complicit lines available after such a detailed investigation has been finished.

In my last letter I talked about the "Johnson touch." I did not mean to point only to L. B. J. This is the highest possible level of complicity, the Vice President of the United States. But there are other individuals in the gov/t at that time and now who were and are perfectly capable of such an assassination. I might mention here Dean Rusk. If there are others, in the public eye who ~~they are people not in the public eye who~~ they do not impress me as being hysterical enough to go through with something so grotesque. It is the person not in the public eye ~~kind of person~~ who you run into through your investigations which I never get a chance to assess. This is why I have been so curious about your work because I thought you were the one person who did have access to such people...

It may be that complicity in the permanent gov/t does not go high. I still think it goes up to a dept. The National Security Council, the C. I. A., the F. B. I. and the Secret Service are all interesting places to start.

The substance of my offer to help you in

understanding the personality of an X, Y, or Z is to aid you whenever you run into ~~the~~ a situation where there are not enough facts to keep you rolling along. Then I can help you to catch that momentum and pick up the facts on the other side of that gap... My reccomendations about a person who I assume is able to be bribed, blaikmailed, or something worse can act as upper limits to the numerous possibilities in these gap regions. By no means do I see myself in any other role but that of a speculator who picks the most likely possibility...

You think about it awhile and may be you will get to like this kind of aid. If not I do not mind as I can always continue with more of the same talk I have been engaging in now for the last month. If it is not too unimportant.

The fact that Oswald was involved in the C. I. A. does not point to the fact that at the time of the assassination he was or was not an agent in the C. I. A. It is an interesting theory which I do not think much of anymore, viz., Oswald was spying on the Cuban groups... To me Oswald was an inept person who got in trouble with the big boys.

I hope you do not think I am a moth looking for the perverbial flame. There is nothing romantic about your hard work and Mr. Garrison's hard work. Hard work! And perhaps even dangerous work? The truth about the assassination has got to be presented to the people soon.

I can rest easy about the Garrison case since you are there to represent truth. I hope that Garrison and Weisberg have all the facts and I wish you and him God speed.

It may be that a young ambitious social psychologist should remain in his ivory tower and let the world go by but in times such as these survival calls for hard work. My survival depends on everyone else's survival. My life in the ivory tower is just as insecure as anyone who is on the front lines at home or abroad. Because if we have a mad-man in the White House almost anything can happen! Whether Johnson has flipped now as a result of the war he is losing or if he flipped long ago the same result will take place. We will be involved in a conventional war which may escalate to the nuclear war we all dread. The very thing that Kennedy was trying to avoid has now become terrible reality. The only way to reverse our fate is to expose all those in our gov/t who are directly or indirectly involved in our present plight. A bright light will change our country for the better. When is this bright light going to be needed? Now. It may be that you will lose prestige as an objective critic if you draw the lines of complicity but the American people are not after objectivity today, but subjectivity, Why... The how is a matter for perfectionists out to prove that the world is pear shaped. The truth is so simple that every American feels it in his breast.

Yours Paul